

## REMARKS

The Applicant appreciates the review of the application by the Examiner. Reconsideration and allowance are requested.

No new matter has been added by the amendments. No new issues are raised by the amendments.

Kindly examine the withdrawn claims.

Kindly reconsider and allow all of the claims. The invention is unitary and the claims are but different expressions of the single invention as encouraged by law, rules and established procedure.

All claims are classified in a single subclass, 264/517, and there is no excessive extra effort required of the examiner to search and to examine those claims.

The inventions are not distinct. The process as claimed cannot be used to make other and materially different product. The product as claimed cannot be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). As claimed, the product cannot be made by another and materially different process such as that forming a block of silicon material then reshaping the block into the wafer boat. That would do violence to the claims.

Neither Alliegro, Sibley, nor Nakayama shows the specific composition as claimed, wherein X is greater than zero and less than one.

None of Alliegro, Sibley, Nakayama and Moritoki suggests the specific composition as claimed, wherein X is greater than zero and less than one.


Claims 389-409 all have that feature and should be allowed.

Nothing in Moritoki or any other reference would have suggested their combination. There would have been no motivation to combine Moritoki with the other references. Moritoki makes an insulator by trapping gas in holes in perforated layers between solid shells in a graphite sheet laminate and has no relation to the other references.

CONCLUSION

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully,



James C. Wray, Reg. No. 22,693  
1493 Chain Bridge Road  
Suite 300  
McLean, Virginia 22101  
Tel: (703) 442-4800  
Fax: (703) 448-7397

May 31, 2006